



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the present writer often saw in written exercises *paenae* for *paene*, obviously the result of the difficulty of discriminating between *ae* and *e* when pronounced nearly alike. When *ae* is pronounced like the diphthong *i*, such a mistake becomes impossible. Quantity, both visible and 'hidden', should be carefully marked in pronunciation from the first. If a boy never hears a false quantity he will not be tempted to make one. Some boys may turn out classical scholars and an accurate knowledge of quantity will be essential for them. How can a boy appreciate the sound of Latin verse, much less write verses himself, when he is taught to say *bōnus*, *mīlēs*? Books for beginners should have all the naturally long vowels marked. The pupil will then clearly understand that all other vowels are short, and the mark for a short vowel becomes a superfluity. American teachers generally adopt this plan; it has not yet found favour in England, although recommended by Professor Postgate. No time is lost by attending to quantity early. It is as easy to learn a correct pronunciation as an incorrect one, if only the former is taught from the first".

Mr. Jones has not yet learned "that the introduction of the Roman pronunciation (in America) was a fundamental blunder, and that its retention is likewise a serious mistake"; that "it is extremely difficult, brings no compensating advantages" but "does bring certain distinct disadvantages". Deluded man! Or was Mr. Bennett really the deluded one?

SOME SUGGESTIONS AS TO LATIN STUDY

The articles touching upon Latin teaching in the first number of *The Classical Weekly* interested me so much that I want to set forth a few ideas of my own on the subject. I do it with a certain diffidence because so many years have gone by since I myself taught Latin, but my love for the language and my belief in its educational value have in no way diminished, and I hope what I have to say may not be without interest to the readers of *The Classical Weekly*.

It seems to me, in the first place, that many classical teachers both in schools and in the universities have not as clear an idea as they ought of what they desire to accomplish in their Latin teaching. What do we study Latin for in these days, and what sort of knowledge of the language shall we aim at acquiring? Surely the view promulgated some years ago by a distinguished professor, that "the only rational justification of the study of Latin in our secondary schools" is "to be found in its unique effect in stimulating and elevating the pupil's intellectual processes, and most of all in the increased mastery of the resources of the mother tongue which

it confers", disregards one very important—to my mind the most important—part of the value of Latin study, and when the learned sponsor of the view referred to adds that the only thing which can make the study thus effective in his sense is "careful daily translation under wise guidance", accompanied by "a severe and laborious comparison of the value of alternative English words, phrases, and sentences", and, above all, by "a painfully thorough grammatical discipline", he seems to me not only to exaggerate the value both of translation and of grammatical drill, but also to paint the study of Latin in unduly somber and repellent colors from the pupil's point of view.

The educational value of Latin as mere mental discipline, though higher than that of any other language and quite high enough, I think, to justify the amount of time allotted to Latin, is still a thing shared by various other branches of study, scientific or mathematical, while language study has a special value of its own as the means of attaining the deepest, truest, and most complete appreciation of the life and thought of the people whose native tongue the given language is, and Latin possesses this value to a degree as much greater than any other tongue as the debt of our civilization is greater to the Romans than to any other people. I make no exception of the Greeks because their influence upon the modern world was so largely exerted through the Romans.

If my reasoning is sound, our ultimate aim in learning or teaching Latin should be, as with a modern language, the acquisition of as nearly as possible the same mastery of it as we have of our own language. The power to think in the foreign language is the first essential of such a mastery, and this power can only come from the initiative of the learner; it can no more be directly imparted to him by a teacher through "a painfully thorough grammatical discipline" or by any other process than one can make a rose bush bloom by wiring buds to its branches. Least of all can it come from "careful (and elegant) daily translation". Translation is, of course, a profitable exercise, but so long as the learner needs the words of his native speech as a bridge between his thought and the thought expressed in a foreign language, and so long as his mind retains even the shadow of a half-conscious feeling that the thing called *cheval* by the French and *equos* by the Romans is in reality a *horse* labelled with a queer name, so long as one cannot get rid of the natural enough sense of greater substantiality, so to speak, in the word *horse* than in the words *cheval*, *pferd*, *equos*, ἵππος, and what not, one has acquired no real power of thinking in the foreign language. Not everybody is capable of this highest intellectual activity in the sphere of

language, but the attempt rationally made to reach it is, it seems to me, the most profitable kind of language study.

In the case of Latin there are special difficulties. One is, or at all events used to be—I hope and am inclined to believe that the situation has improved in this respect—that many of our teachers unfortunately did not themselves have that intimate grasp of Latin as Latin which I have described. Too often, in order to gain a clear idea of a complicated Latin passage, they had to *translate* it to themselves. Another difficulty is that the Roman habit of mind was so different from ours that Latin words, except in the case of simple concrete things or simple acts, seldom coincide exactly in meaning with English words belonging to the same parts of speech. This is one chief reason why continual painstaking translation is so much less effective as a means of achieving a working knowledge of Latin than such translation is of acquiring a like knowledge of French or German or Italian, for instance. In any civilized modern foreign language the pupil can generally get from his dictionary a verb or noun or adjective with which to translate a given verb or noun or adjective respectively into English or vice versa well enough to cause not only himself but his teacher, who knows both languages, to suppose that the pupil understands the thing said, even when he may not have, and I am afraid often does not have, a quite clear notion of it even as expressed in his native language. You cannot do that in the case of Latin. What can you do? Practice in comparing “the value of alternative English words, phrases, and sentences” seems to me pretty ineffective—at least until much progress has been made otherwise—because it presupposes that the pupil knows somehow already what the meaning of the Latin is and is casting about for its best form of English expression. But how are we to get at this Latin meaning itself? Most simple words, especially in such early languages as Latin, originally designated simple objects in the physical world or simple physical acts or qualities. I would have the pupil first learn these simple meanings thoroughly, beginning with the words he will meet most frequently in his reading, and then trace the development of the words into representatives of kindred meanings or deflected meanings, so that when he comes to read connected sentences and finds a familiar looking word the meaning of which is not immediately clear to him, his first thought shall be to try to derive from its original meaning a meaning that makes sense with the words of the sentence already understood, instead of looking into the dictionary or elsewhere for some random English word set down among others as one of the labels of his Latin word. This

is a very different process from making up your mind somehow what a sentence means or ought to mean, and then forcing the words into that meaning. Perhaps it may seem a hard process and one lacking in interest to a young pupil, but I feel confident that it can be made both more interesting and easier than the usual processes to the average beginner in Latin. Something of the need of it is hinted at and illustrated with the words *petere*, *ponere consilium* and others by Miss Ella Catherine Greene in her admirable article in the first number of *The Classical Weekly*.

Much more profitable to the pupil also than translating Latin into English, especially in the early stages of his study, is the translation of English into Latin and most of all the writing down in Latin his thoughts, however crude, about the things he sees around him and the events of his young experience or observation. And here, while not encouraging unclassical and made-up Latin, I would not have the teacher insist overmuch upon the use of the words of the Golden Age only, provided the syntax and general structure of the pupils' efforts are those of real Latin. Such practice greatly reduces the amount of formal drilling in grammar necessary for the management of even simple Latin, and I believe that both time and energy would be saved if the hours given to Latin were more equally divided between writing Latin and translating.

I am reminded of a specially important point by a quotation from a textbook in a review full of good sense by Mr. John Edmund Barss in this same first number of *The Classical Weekly*. He says that the statement that “The unit in language is the sentence” expresses “an important truth” but “ignores the fact that the idea of units as applied to language is one not easily gained by a child”. It seems to me that whatever theoretical value the truth thus set forth has the uselessness of the dictum is not so much due to a failure on the part of the child to understand the application of the term “units” as to his tendency to regard the individual words as units strung along in the sentence like beads on a cord, when for practical purposes, in Latin at least, it is the phrases and subordinate clauses which are the real units in the relations of the parts of the sentence to the sentence as a whole. I used to find that when my pupils had learned to consider not only the subordinate clauses but also phrases like the combination of a noun with a genitive or a qualifying adjective or of a noun with a participle in the ablative absolute as the units of which the sentence might be said to be composed they found it distinctly easier to manage the sentence intelligently. This was notably the case in regard to the order of the words. Latin periods, much more than most English sentences, present a

series of pictures to the imagination, words in Latin are more used metaphorically with a vividness undiminished by age or through wandering too far from their original meanings, and the perspective of these pictures becomes much clearer when one looks at the phrases and clauses which constitute them separately as complete pictorial entities in which the most prominent object always occupies the foreground and the others recede in proportion to their lesser importance. For this is the principle of Latin word-order, scarcely affected by considerations of syntax or other extraneous things.

It is a great pity that the writings of the Romans which have come down to us are so exclusively of a kind that appeals to mature minds only, and this fact makes the task of the Latin teacher exceptionally difficult, but I cannot help believing that the process of acquiring as good a mastery of the language as possible along some such lines as I have urged is not only better training for the pupil's mind as such but also more likely to fit him to read and enjoy Latin literature when he reaches greater mental development than is the attempt to pump that literature into him prematurely through the traditional amount of formal grammatical drill and Latin passages done into so-called English.

HENRY PREBLE

REVIEWS

Latin Composition For Secondary Schools. By Benjamin L. D'Ooge. New York: Ginn and Co. (1904). Pp. vi + 131 + 190. \$1.00.

In this book an attempt is made to add a systematic treatment of grammar to the advantages of composition work which is based for content and vocabulary directly on the texts read. Those teachers, therefore, who believe in basing the composition work directly on the text read will find in this book several features of value. Specific grammatical references are given, the explanations are clear though sometimes too comprehensive for school use, and the lists of idioms and phrases should prove advantageous. Those teachers who do not believe in basing the composition work directly on the text read will find in part the same objections to this book as to all other books which are based on that theory. Here, as in other books of this sort, we find the same haphazard, hit-or-miss development (or non-development) of vocabulary which results from the theory that a student can acquire a proper knowledge of words from their occasional occurrence in the texts or exercises without definite assignment. The book contains no vocabularies, special or general, except for Part III.

Nor have all of the difficulties of grammatical treatment been met, for throughout the book grammatical constructions are constantly anticipated and

assumed as familiar to the student before the subjects involved are treated. Section 109 in Part I comprises nine sentences of which eight involve purpose or result phrases or clauses, although these subjects are not treated until sections 117 ff. In section 81 one-third of the sentences contain prohibitions, a subject which is treated in section 99. Section 22 contains a sentence requiring *persuadeo* with indirect discourse. Difficult constructions of noun syntax are constantly employed everywhere, though the treatment of noun syntax begins only with Lesson LXXXVII, e. g. *calamitatis reminisci* (62); *magno usui esse* (319); *Gallia Romanis interdicere* (182); *proelio supersedere* (220), etc.

The order of treatment of the principles of grammar, especially in Part I, would seem very faulty in some respects. No syntax of nouns is treated until Lesson LXXXVII and it is even intimated in the introduction that the treatment of noun constructions may well be deferred until Part II is taken up in the Cicero year. Many teachers will seriously question the wisdom of teaching, during the year when Caesar is read, such subjects as the following: Potential Subjunctive, Lesson XXII, (B. G. I 21); Proviso, Lesson LX (B. G. II 25); Rhetorical Questions, Lesson XXI (B. G. I 20); Optative Subjunctive, Lesson XX (B. G. I 18); Conditional Sentences, Lessons LIII-LVII (B. G. II 11-19); Conditional Sentences in Indirect Discourse, Lessons LXV-LXIX (B. G. II 31-III 5). Of these usages the first four do not occur in Caesar. Such independent conditions as occur (three instances in books I-IV) are all in the indicative and require no explanations. Subordinate conditions are entirely too difficult for students at this period and can all be explained for the time being on the basis of sequence of tenses and attraction.

In many cases throughout the book, but particularly in Part I, the exercises follow the text to which the student is referred too closely. In some cases whole lines may be copied directly from the text. Cf. Part I, sections 25, 157.

Part I contains one hundred and ten exercises, approximately one exercise for each chapter of Caesar, and it is suggested in the introduction that "they can be used most easily and profitably in connection with each day's review lesson". This would seem to involve the problem of time in most schools, especially when we find, for example, in Lesson XCII that the student is expected to learn all the constructions of the genitive with verbs and to prepare eleven sentences in connection with his day's work in Caesar. So also with Lesson LXXXIX, which has eight references and twelve sentences. Nine lessons are starred for possible omission and it is suggested in the introduction that Lessons